

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 07/804,474 GREENE 12/06/91 EXAMINER YUEN, H ROBERT M. CHIAVIELLO, JR. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT BAKER & BOTTS 1000 TRAMMELL CROW CENTER 2001 ROSS AVE. 3404 DALLAS, TX 75201-2916 DATE MAILED: This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire. wa from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(8) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 6. 🗆 information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. SUMMARY OF ACTION 1. D Claims are pending in the application. 26 Of the above, claims are withdrawn from consideration. 2. Ciaims 3. Claims 5. Cialms are objected to. Clain are subject to restriction or election requirement. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_ . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are  $\square$  acceptable.  $\square$  not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on ... \_ has (have) been 🔲 approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_ \_, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation). 12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has 🗌 been received 🗎 not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. \_ ; filed on . 13. 🔲 Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 9-89)

Serial No. 804474

Art Unit 3404

Claims 1-26 are in the case. Claims 15-21 and 26 stand withdrawn from consideration.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-14, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Houser U.S. Pat 4,958,578 in view of Kent U.S. Pat. 4922841. Houser shows an injector 1-4 for blowing waste material into a first combustion chamber 10 and a second combustion chamber 17 with particle separator means 26 and liquid filter means 37 for chemically treating the fired exhaust gases. Air injector means 9 supplies air into first chamber 10 and a damper means 14 controls air in second chamber 17. Kent shows neutralizer and cooler 62 for temperature reduction. Therefore, to provide Hardley (at 32) with a cooler and neutralizer of Kent would have been obvious in order to reduce pollutants. The

Serial No. 804474

Art Unit 3404

claimed  ${\rm O}_2$  rich and deficient combustion stages are well known in the art.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/12/91 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. <u>Broad</u> claims presented are unpatentable over the art. Houser patent clearly shows the means 37 for capturing the particulate matter and chemically heating the same.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

HENRY C. YUEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 344

H. YUEN:th June 29, 1992 703-308-2125